

### REMARKS

The examiner has objected to the disclosure because it lacks a brief summary of the invention.

The examiner has stated that the applicant is required to provide a "brief summary of the invention" in order to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.73. However, the rule reads, "A brief summary of the invention...*should* precede the detailed description. Such summary *should, when set forth*, be commensurate with the invention...(emphasis added)." Since the word "should" does not necessitate the inclusion of a summary and since the phrase "when set forth" indicates that a summary is at the applicant's discretion, the applicants refute the examiner's objection. The applicants choose not to include a brief summary.

The examiner has objected to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis under 37 CF §1.75(d), paragraph 1 and MPEP §608.01(o). The examiner objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicants have amended the specification at page 5 and at page 10, and amended FIG. 3. The applicants believe that these amendments should overcome the examiner's objections. No new matter has been added.

The examiner has rejected claims 28-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The applicants have amended claim 28 to overcome the examiner's rejection. The amendment should also overcome the rejection of claims 29-35, which depend on claim 28. No new matter has been added.

The examiner has rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lipman et al. (U.S. 6,192,051).

The applicants claim “a large table at a root,” whereas Lipman, by contrast, describes a “routing table [that] contains a plurality of routing entries (col. 10, lines 33-34),” or pointers. The route does not include a large table, as the applicants contend, but is merely a table itself. Similarly, the applicants claim a “root branching to nodes containing small trie tables.” Lipman describes “sub-trees at the three different levels [that] index into the routing entries (col. 10, lines 54-55).” These sub-trees contain only pointers, such as IP addresses (col. 10, last paragraph). Once again, Lipman does not describe or suggest nodes containing tree tables, as the applicants do, but simply the trees themselves. Lipman therefore does not anticipate claim 23, which along with its dependent claims 24-27, should be allowable.

The examiner has also rejected claim 28 as being anticipated by Lipman.

As with claim 23, Lipman describes neither a “large table at a root” nor “two nodes containing small trie tables.” Furthermore, applicants claim a method that includes “traversing in parallel the two trie tables to find a match of a trie entry to the prefix,” but Lipman describes “lookup requests” that “are arbitrated in a round-robin manner, and a lookup request at a given port is performed only if there is sufficient room for the result to be stored (col. 14, lines 32-36).” Such requests are clearly traversed in a serial, not a parallel, fashion. Lipman therefore does not anticipate claim 28. Claim 28 and its dependent claims 29-35 should be allowable.

The examiner has rejected claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipman.

The examiner contends that Lipman obviates claims 33-35 but not claim 28, the independent claim on which they depend. Since Lipman does not obviate claim 28 and since

Applicant : Donald F. Hooper  
Serial No. : 09/608,354  
Filed : June 29, 2000  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-222001 / P8715

claims 33-35 depend upon and further limit the independent claim, Lipman cannot obviate claims 33-35. These claims should therefore be allowable.

The fact that the applicants have addressed certain positions of the examiner does not mean that the applicants concede other stated positions of the examiner. The fact that the applicants have made arguments for patentability of claims does not mean that the applicants concede that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

July 22, 2004

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

Kenneth F. Kozik  
Kenneth F. Kozik  
Reg. No. 36,572